



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/813,031	03/31/2004	Hiroki Goko	030712-36	3838
78198	7590	07/15/2009		
Studebaker & Brackett PC 1890 Preston White Drive Suite 105 Reston, VA 20191			EXAMINER	
			MEMULA, SURESH	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2825	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/15/2009 PAPER	

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/813,031		<b>Applicant(s)</b> GOKO ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> SURESH MEMULA		<b>Art Unit</b> 2825	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) SURESH MEMULA (Examiner). (3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Luan Do (Applicant's representative). (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 07 July 2009.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 2.

Identification of prior art discussed: US Pub. No. 2004/0230933 to Weaver, JR. et al..

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's representative explicated the subject matter of claims 1 and 2 and contrasted it to the teachings of the Weaver reference. The point at issue between the Examiner and Applicant remains to be whether Weaver is anticipatory of Applicant's "prior to performing layout design" limitation recited in claim 1. No agreement was reached. A copy of this interview summary was sent to Applicant via fax.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Suresh Memula/ Art Unit 2825	/Jack Chiang/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2825
----------------------------------	---